

SURRATT, JACOB W., Ed.D. Physical Activity Instruction Requirements in Higher Education. (2019)

Directed by Dr. Diane L. Gill. 49 pp.

For many years, Physical Activity Instruction (PAI) courses have been a staple in higher education curricular programming, viewed as a necessity to enhance the overall knowledge and growth of students (Hensley, 2000). According to several studies, there has been a significant decrease from the early 20th century requirements. McCristal and Miller (1939) identified that 97% of institutions required PE in 1939 while in 1969, 87% of institutions required it. Moving toward the 21st century, 63% of institutions required PE for graduation in 2000 (Hensley, 2000), which reduced to 39.5% in 2012 (Cardinal, et al.). The goal of this project was to determine if this trend continues, and to identify strategies to address it.

The purpose of this project was to evaluate the current PAI requirement for undergraduates at four-year institutions in North Carolina and Virginia. In addition, the study aimed to identify successful advocacy strategies to share with Kinesiology professionals in higher education.

A comprehensive review of the undergraduate catalogs from each institution in North Carolina and Virginia (n = 54) was conducted in July and August 2018 to identify the PAI requirement. Surveys were sent to the department chair who manages the PAI courses, and interviews were conducted with five administrators at institutions in North Carolina and Virginia in October and November 2018.

Data analysis revealed differences in requirements across states, classifications, size, and funding type. All four-year colleges and universities (54) in the states of North

Carolina and Virginia were investigated, revealing that 34 (62.9%) currently require PAI for all undergraduates. Size of institution was related to the requirement. Institutions classified as Master's Larger Programs were most likely to have the requirement (89%), and Doctoral High Research Activity institutions were least likely to have the requirement (31%).

Survey responses also provided information on the credits institutions require for PAI and instructor assignment. Of the 31 institutions that participated in the survey, the largest number (n=12, 39%) had two credits for PAI with others requiring only 1 or up to 4 credits. As faculty instructional assignment was explored, the largest number (n=20) of institutions that require PAI use full-time and adjunct faculty most of the time. The surveys and interview results revealed that quality in instruction and program are essential for success. Qualified, consistent faculty assignment, developing student learning outcomes, and variety of courses are characteristic of institutions with successful PAI programs. This information provided from the study may be used to make recommendations to ensure quality is being built into PAI programs across higher education.

PHYSICAL ACTIVITY INSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS IN HIGHER
EDUCATION

by

Jacob W. Surratt

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
2019

Approved by

Committee Chair

© 2019 Jacob W. Surratt

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation, written by Jacob W. Surratt, has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at the University of North Carolina Greensboro.

Committee Chair _____

Committee Members _____

Date of Acceptance by Committee

Date of Final Oral Examination

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
CHAPTER	
I. PROJECT OVERVIEW	1
Relevant Literature.....	3
Purpose Statement.....	6
Methods.....	7
Results.....	10
Discussion and Implications	16
II. DISSEMINATION	21
Report and Recommendations	21
III. ACTION PLAN	30
REFERENCES	35
APPENDIX A. RECRUITMENT E-MAIL.....	38
APPENDIX B. CATALOG CODING RUBRIC.....	39
APPENDIX C. ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY	40
APPENDIX D. ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE	41
APPENDIX E. ADDED RESULTS TABLES	42

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. PAI for Undergraduates: State and Funding Type.....	10

CHAPTER I

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Physical Activity Instruction (PAI) courses have been an integral requirement in undergraduate higher education for decades, but such requirements have changed drastically in recent years. For example, only 39.5% of institutions required some form of PAI course for graduation in 2012 (Cardinal, Sorensen, & Cardinal, 2012) compared to 97% of institutions requiring PAI in the mid-20th century (McCristal & Miller, 1939). Yet the research demonstrates that college-aged students are interested in their health and fitness and want to improve it. Achieving optimal health and fitness is a primary reason that college students choose to participate in exercise (McArthur & Raedeke 2009). As more campuses across the nation strive to increase the health and wellness of students by participating in initiatives that align with the Health Campus programs, PAI is being removed. This trend directly contradicts the current focus on student well-being that is found in the mission statements of institutions across the country (Armstrong et al., 2014). Therefore, it is imperative to determine if this trend continues, and also to identify and develop strategies to address it. Simply investigating the trends is not enough. Dedicated physical education professionals must advocate for PAI, or professional practice in this area will become extinct in higher education.

PAI courses have been shown to play a significant role in modifying lifestyle behavior for physical activity (Adams & Brynteson, 1995). Approximately 46% of

traditional-age college students achieve the recommended amounts of moderate to vigorous physical activity (American Heart Association, 2015). This trend is a concern at colleges and universities as validated through the Healthy Campus 2020 initiatives led by the American College Health Association. Many institutions are realizing the need to implement various wellness and fitness programs and initiatives to assist students in achieving optimal wellness. In addition to declining physical fitness, mental health issues among college students are also a great concern.

In a large study of community college students in seven states, a shocking 49% reported at least one mental health issue, especially depression at 36% and anxiety at 29% (Eisenberg, Goldrick-Rab, Lipson, & Broton, 2016). Forty-two percent of students experienced more than average stress, 57% suffered from overwhelming anxiety, 34% felt so depressed it affected their ability to function, and 85% were overwhelmed by all they had to do (American Heart Association, 2015).

As college students are typically in their early adult years, they are at a crossroads of developing lasting lifestyle habits (Stellefson et al., 2015; Sullivan et al., 2008). College students often face first-time challenges that place them at great risk. Binge drinking, drug use, reduced physical activity, and smoking may all develop during these formative years (Leenders et al., 2003). However, during these crucial years, college-aged students are interested in their health and fitness and want to improve it. Achieving optimal health and fitness is a primary reason that college students choose to participate in exercise (McArthur & Raedeke 2009).

Relevant Literature

For many years, PAI courses have been a staple in higher education curricular programming and viewed as a necessary requirement to enhance the overall knowledge and growth of students (Hensley, 2000). According to several studies, there has been a significant decrease from the early and mid-20th century requirements. McCristal and Miller (1939) identified that 97% of institutions required PAI in 1939 while in 1969, 87% of institutions required it. Moving further toward the 21st century, 63% of institutions required PAI for graduation in 2000 (Hensley, 2000), which reduced to 39.5% in 2012 (Cardinal, et al.). As PAI requirements in higher education have declined, evidence supporting the importance of physical activity for overall health and well-being has increased.

Trends in Physical Activity Instruction Requirements

The current state of PAI requirements at the collegiate level is quite different compared to the beginning of the 20th century. Many institutions have either changed or removed the PAI requirement. At the turn of the 21st century, 1 in 4 institutions reported that the PAI course requirement was challenged or considered for elimination during the last five years. One of the primary reasons reported for these cuts was the reduction in the overall general education requirements (Hensley, 2000). According to Strand (2010), in 1961, 84% of US colleges and universities required PAI for graduation. At the close of that decade that rate had increased to 87% (Strand, 2010); however, the requirement rapidly changed during the 1970s. In 1972, 94% of US colleges and universities offered PAI courses and 74% required them for graduation. Yet, in 1978, institutions that

required PAI courses dropped dramatically from 87% to 57% (Lumpkin & Jenkins, 1993), but approximately 74% still offered the courses as electives (Strand, 2010). Progression into the 1980s saw a reversal in the decline in offering and requirement of PAI courses in the United States. According to Hensley (2000), 63% of institutions responded that PAI courses were a part of graduation requirements in 1987 and 66% in 1993.

Physical Activity and Health in College Students

According to a 2011 special report by the World Health Organization (WHO), physical inactivity is one of the primary risk factors for global death, and the levels are rising in many countries. Additionally, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2014) identified that only 1 in 5 (21%) adults meets national physical activity guidelines. Despite the mounting evidence linking a sedentary lifestyle to health-related complications, there remains a rise in both physical inactivity and its associated negative health effects in all age, gender, race and other socioeconomic categories. Approximately 46% of young adults (ages 18-34 years) achieve the recommended amounts of moderate to vigorous physical activity a day (American Heart Association, 2015). These data trends signify that physical activity, or lack thereof, is also a large concern for college students, which has been confirmed through the Healthy Campus 2020 initiatives led by the American College Health Association. In this work, 10 leading health indicators were identified that reflect concerns at college campuses, one of which is physical inactivity (Strand et al., 2010). While obesity and physical inactivity are major health risk factors for college-aged students, mental health issues are rapidly becoming an even larger

concern. Of 4,300 community college students in seven states, a shocking 49% reported at least one mental health issue, especially depression at 36% and anxiety at 29% (Eisenberg, Goldrick-Rab, Lipson, & Broton, 2016). The Executive Summary provided by the American Heart Association in 2015 cited alarming statistics on the mental health of college students; 42% of students experienced more than average stress, 57% suffered from overwhelming anxiety, 34% felt so depressed it affected their ability to function, and 85% were overwhelmed by all they had to do. Physical and mental health can also affect academic performance. Findings from a study of health behaviors in college students and their academic performance suggested that healthy eating habits, quality sleep, and increased physical activity had a positive impact on academic performance (Williams, Greene, Satinsky, & Neuberger, 2016).

Increasing Physical Activity on College Campuses

As modern society continues to face health-related concerns and attempts to identify prevention strategies, college campuses are realizing they are also faced with the same struggles. As college students are typically in their early adult years, they are at a crossroads of developing lasting lifestyle habits (Stellefson et al., 2015; Sullivan et al., 2008). Often while enrolled in a higher education institution, they face first-time challenges that place them at great risks because of the choices being made. Binge drinking, drug use, reduced physical activity, and smoking may all develop during these formative years (Leenders et al., 2003). However, during these crucial years, college-aged students are interested in their health and fitness and want to improve it (McArthur & Raedeke, 2009). In addition, physical activity and fitness is one of the primary aspects

of overall health sought by college-aged students (American College of Health Association, 2010). Even as more campuses across the nation strive to increase the health and wellness of students by participating in initiatives that align with their Healthy Campus programs, PAI courses are being removed as a requirement for graduation. This trend directly contradicts the current focus on student well-being that is found in the mission statements of institutions across the country (Armstrong, 2014).

Given that PAI originally began as a way to educate students in physical fitness and hygiene, revisiting this purpose may provide an answer to the deterioration in health among college students and society at large. As pointed out by Hensley (2000), the field is changing rapidly, and institutions and faculty that change with it can thrive, especially ones that change to meet the market-driven needs of consumers.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this project was to identify the current status and changes in PAI requirements, and strategies used to maintain the requirement in higher education institutions. Determining successful strategies institutions have used to ensure the survival of PAI courses is key to developing an effective advocacy strategy. These goals were accomplished through completion of the following two aims:

Aim 1: Determine the current status of PAI requirements in four-year colleges and universities in North Carolina and Virginia, and how those requirements have changed in the last five years.

Aim 2: To identify strategies and approaches that can be used to promote, maintain, and enhance PAI requirements.

Although researchers have investigated PAI requirements in higher education, none have used the information to develop advocacy strategies. We not only need to understand the trend of declining PAI requirements, but also determine ways to reverse or prevent it from continuing.

Methods

To accomplish these aims, the study investigated PAI requirements at four-year colleges and universities in Virginia and North Carolina. Information was obtained through a review of course catalogues from four-year colleges/universities in North Carolina and Virginia. In addition to catalog reviews, follow-up surveys and interviews with department chairs were conducted to collect additional information about the history of the program requirements, challenges, and suggestions for program retention.

Participants

All publicly available catalogs from the four-year colleges and universities in North Carolina and Virginia ($n = 54$) were investigated in the study. Department chairs from each of the 54 institutions were invited to participate in a survey. Of the 54 department chairs who were sent an invitation, 31 chose to participate in the survey. Of the respondents, 22 (71%) were from North Carolina, and the other nine (29%) work at Virginia institutions. From this group 17 (54%) were from privately funded institutions, while public colleges or universities employed the other 14 (45%). At the completion of the survey, the administrators were also invited to participate in a follow-up interview.

From the group of 31 department chairs, five elected to participate in a follow-up interview. Three within the group were department chairs and tenured professors, while

two were senior lecturers or instructors who oversaw the management of the PAI courses. Within this group, two worked at private institutions, compared to the three employed at publicly-funded colleges or universities. Three were from North Carolina and the other two from Virginia.

Measurements

Catalog Reviews: All catalog information was accessed and reviewed via each institution's website. During the review, specific information about each institution, and the current PAI requirement was documented. The requirement statement and full description was recorded, while also noting details such as number of credits and the type of courses that satisfy the requirement.

Following completion of the catalog reviews, data were compiled into an excel document. Information was coded and analyzed descriptively to identify and describe PAI requirements within different categories (see Appendix B).

Administrator Surveys: Department Chairs ($n = 31$) at the institutions included in the study participated in a survey to provide more specific information about the requirements. Within the survey were questions designed to provide an opportunity to confirm the information collected from the published website, as well as describe the current and historical instructor assignments, and any previous or anticipated changes to the current requirement. (See Appendix C).

Interviews: Following the surveys, administrators were offered an opportunity to participate in a follow-up interview to further explore and expand upon information collected from the websites and follow-up questionnaires. The interview questions were

designed to cultivate discussion and collect information regarding the details of the requirements, previous and potential future changes in the requirement, and strategies and approaches for promoting the requirement (see Appendix D for interview guide).

Procedures

During the summer of 2018, approval for the study was sought and received from the IRB at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. Once approval was obtained, recruitment of participants and data collection began. The first step was to review all undergraduate graduation requirements at each of the 54 institutions through the college catalog on each institution's website. Data were compiled into a spreadsheet that allowed for analysis and comparison across categories such as Carnegie Classification, type (public or private) of institution, location (NC or VA), and size.

After compiling the catalog information, department chairs that oversee PAI courses at all 54 colleges and universities were sent an e-mail invitation to participate in a survey. Included in the individualized e-mail was the exact wording pertaining to the undergraduate and kinesiology major PAI requirement for review and reference if the administrator chose to participate in the survey. The survey was created and distributed through Qualtrics provided by UNCG. Survey distribution began in late September 2018 and continued through November with 31 department chairs participating in the survey. The information was downloaded into an excel spreadsheet for analysis.

Following the surveys, administrators were offered an opportunity to participate in a follow-up interview. Five administrators, two from Virginia, and three from North Carolina elected to participate in the interviews and were coded V1, V2, NC1, NC2, and

NC3. All interviews were conducted, organized, and recorded online, through WebEx, provided by UNCG. Responses to the interview questions were reviewed to identify common responses and trends.

Results

Results of the catalog review are presented first, followed by survey and interview results.

Catalog Review

Undergraduate catalogs for the 54 four-year colleges and universities were reviewed through each institution's website. The sample included public and private institutions of varying size and Carnegie classification. Out of the sample 35 (65%) were from North Carolina and the other 19 (35%) were located in Virginia. The dispersion of public and private institutions was an even split at 50% (27) each. Out of the total, 34 (63%) required PAI courses for undergraduates; 24 schools in North Carolina and 10 in Virginia had the requirement intact. When looking within each state, 69% of schools in North Carolina had the requirement compared with 53% for Virginia institutions.

Table 1. PAI for Undergraduates: State and Funding Type

	PAI requirement for Undergraduates		Participating Universities/Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	34	62.9%	54	100%
North Carolina	24	68.5%	35	64.8%
Virginia	10	52.6%	19	35.2%
Public	15	55.5%	27	50%
Private	19	70.3%	27	50%

As table 1 indicates, 15 of the 27 public designated schools (55%) required PAI for undergraduates, while 19 (70%) that were designated Private, non-for profit had the requirement in place. Institutions of higher learning are classified by the Carnegie Institution, and those Carnegie classifications were used to identify trends. Of the 13 classified as Doctoral Universities: Higher Research Activity, only four (31%) required PAI. Only one of the two Doctoral Universities with Moderate Research activity required physical activity. Master's Colleges and Universities were broken into three categories, Larger Programs, Medium Programs, and Small Programs. Eight of the nine colleges with larger programs (89%) had the requirement, while five of eight (63%) of Medium programs and three of four (75%) of the small program institutions required PAI for undergraduates. Several institutions were classified as Baccalaureate colleges (n = 18) with eight having an Arts and Sciences focus and the other 10 focused on Diversified Fields. From this group six of the eight (75%) that focus on Arts and Sciences required PAI while eight (80%) of the 10 from Diversified Colleges were found to have the requirement.

Based on total enrollment institutions were broken into categories: 0-5,000; 5,000-10,000; 10,000-15,000; 15,000-20,000; 20,000- 25,000; and 25,000+ students. Nineteen of the 26 (73%) institutions with less than 5,000 were found to have the requirement. As institutions grew in size, the number with a requirement declined - 69% of institutions with 5,000-10,000 students, 50% of institutions with 10,000-15,000 and 15,000-20,000 students required it, while only 33% and 38% of institutions with 20,000-25,000 and 25,000+ students respectively required it.

Survey Results

The administrator survey was sent to 54 department chairs and experienced a 57% response rate (n=31). Out of the 31 respondents, only one indicated that the published information in the catalog was incorrect. Of the institutions that participated in the survey 17 (45%) require PAI courses for undergraduates.

When asked who currently teaches the PAI courses, only one institution (3%) stated they use full-time, regular faculty. The majority of institutions (48%) stated they use a mixture of both full-time, regular faculty, and adjunct faculty. Two participating institutions (6%) only use adjunct faculty to teach the courses, while three (9%) use a mixture of adjunct faculty and graduate assistants. Nine of the institutions (29%) use graduate assistants either as the sole instructors, or as a mixture with full-time and adjuncts. Of those nine institutions, only one (3%) used only graduate assistants to provide all of the instruction in PAI courses, and also required all undergraduates to complete such a course.

When asked if there had been a change to who was assigned instruction in those courses over the last five years, 10 of the 31 colleges (32%) indicated a change had been made. Out of the ten, one college indicated that they moved from primarily adjunct and part-time faculty to full-time faculty, with the reason to improve the quality of instruction. Three of the ten who indicated a change in teaching assignments transitioned from full-time instructors to only adjunct and/or part-time. Within these three, only one provided explanation, stating that the requirement had recently been changed that allowed students to earn credits from physical activity courses. Due to this change, an increase in

needed courses and sections occurred, and the only way to meet instruction was to use primarily adjunct faculty. The remaining six institutions indicated a change, but all of them indicated that a mixture of faculty (full, part, and adjunct) were still used. Of these six, two indicated a recent change in the requirement that has reduced the number of needed full-time faculty. Both institutions are located within the state of North Carolina and are small, privately funded institutions.

Interview Results

Several issues were identified from the interviews. Specifically, faculty assignment, variety (choice), and athletics were all common topics that surfaced.

Faculty Assignment: One aim of the study was to determine who teaches PAI courses and if there had been a change. Interview responses indicated that each institution implements a different assignment strategy, and that strategy has remained consistent over the last five years. At one institution, the department chair stated that “full time instructors are used, which can be faculty or staff.” When asked to elaborate, it was stated “faculty are full-time, non-tenured lecturers, and staff are usually contracted individuals who specialize in a sport or activity.” This was in direct contrast to the response from the chair at a larger university, where the course requirement is purely an elective, where predominantly graduate assistants to provide instruction. That chair stated that approximately “90% of the instruction belongs to graduate assistants, and the other 10% is from contracted staff who specialize.” Use of faculty from other departments on campus was a strategy at one public institution. The coordinator who oversees PAI courses there stated that “when an instructor cannot be found for a particular course

through either full-time or adjunct faculty, it can be offered to others across campus who may have experience in that field.” This is often seen as a positive for those faculty, but also as a way to sell the value of the field across campus. The coordinator stated this is an indirect advocacy model, especially if the value of PAI is ever discussed during curricular council meetings.

Use of graduate assistants was mentioned by the three larger institutions, and each had a different perspective and philosophy. At one institution that had great success and history of keeping the PAI requirement, graduate assistants provided the majority of instruction, while at another institution that had recently advocated for the retention of courses, the coordinator was adamantly against the use of graduate assistants. The Coordinator stated that graduate assistants are not dependable, specifically stating that the “turnover is too frequent.” By the time one has been trained, they leave, creating a massive problem in consistency of instruction and courses offered.

Neither of the smaller bachelor’s degree focused colleges that participated in the interview used graduate assistants due to the lack of availability. However, to meet the need of instruction, both use part-time, specialized staff to provide teaching for unique classes. For example, one institution has recently added several yoga and mental-wellness focused courses to meet student interests. However, none of the full-time faculty have credentialing in this area. To accommodate this need, the institution has contracted with a local wellness agency to allow students to participate in yoga classes. The classes are held off campus, at the agency, which is very close to campus, and led by one of the staff from that organization.

In comparison, the other smaller institution has the same need, except athletics are a huge focus of interest at the institution. To provide courses in golf, and tennis, the department identifies local specialists who are contracted to provide the instruction on a semester-by-semester basis. Like the other institution, this is utilized because no faculty or staff employed by the college are credentialed to teach in these fields. Each believes that their system works well for the institution and curricular needs. Both connected this approach to quality and made similar comments indicating that current requirement has not been challenged at either institution.

Variety (Choice): No matter the institution, providing a variety of course offerings was crucial to having a successful program. All five administrators believe that “being aware of lifetime activity and wellness habits is essential to the curriculum,” but that “variety of choice is also crucial.” Two administrators elaborated to say that their program was built upon this foundation, and it is one of the reasons for the success and lack of challenge. At one smaller institution, students are required to take one standard course focused on lifetime activity, and then two elective choices of any activity class of their interest. At a larger institution, while there is no requirement, students are allowed two activity courses to count toward the bachelor’s degree.

Although choice was a factor for all colleges that participated in the interviews, one saw it as a current factor of concern. In particular, this large research-focused university has no consistency in student learning outcomes, making it difficult to collect data and sell the value to administrators and other faculty. The lack of consistency in

course offerings, standardized syllabi, learning outcomes, and evaluation create huge voids to advocate for PAI at this institution.

Athletics: Athletics was an unexpected category uncovered during the interviews. When discussing faculty assignment, and history of the requirement, athletics and the athletics department were brought up by two representatives. When discussing the current requirement at a smaller institution, it was discovered that some athletic coaches teach specialty courses such as golf and basketball. This led to a follow up question asking what percentage of the student body were athletes. The department chair shared that “approximately 50% of the student population is comprised of student athletes.” In the past this had affected the requirement as it was very athletic-focused, but through much revision, the current requirement is now wellness-focused.

In contrast at the larger institution, athletics had been the focus and home of the PAI courses. Upon arrival, this administrator collaborated with the athletics department to move instruction to the academic side of the university and replace athletic coaches with graduate assistants to provide the majority of instruction. When asked why this was proposed the administrator stated, “quality was essential to instruction, and having consistent instructors who were academically focused would assure proper rigor, and education for students.”

Discussion and Implications

From the catalog reviews, surveys, and interviews, one key theme emerged - quality. Several strategies and decisions surfaced that demonstrated this focus on quality, but none as crucial as instructor assignment. Two of the five institutions from interview

sessions initially had the PAI courses located under the umbrella of athletics, yet they advocated to relocate to academics. Following the move, administrators altered instructional assignments for courses from athletic coaches to faculty, staff, and graduate assistants. More interesting is the use of graduate assistants at the large universities that are still able to retain quality programs. Two of the five institutions used graduate assistants for instruction, however, one voiced concern about this practice. While the graduate assistants provide the majority of instruction, at one institution, the department chair felt that the lone administrator and part-time graduate assistant who manage the courses, monitored quality efficiently. In comparison, at the other institution, use of graduate assistants seemed to be a barrier to hiring more full-time faculty, which could provide more consistent instruction, and providing better oversight for students. For the other larger university that had graduate students as an option, they chose not to use them because of quality. In contrast to others who participated, this institution utilizes several full-time faculty and consistent adjuncts.

Focusing on academics, best practices from research, lifetime wellness and providing choice, as well as having consistent instruction and leadership seem to all be tenets of the quality of the programs. While some of these are intentional, others are not. A great deal can be learned from these philosophies and must be shared so that others who are facing scrutiny can begin to develop the same model.

Several limitations within this study have implications for conclusions and recommendations. First, the sample was limited to a specific geographic location of only four-year colleges and universities in two states (North Carolina and Virginia). While this

specific region included institutions of various sizes, funding types, and classifications, it may not be representative of institutions across the entire country.

In addition to the relatively small number of institutions in the study, an even smaller number of interviews were conducted. Only five administrators participated in interviews, limiting the scope and generalizability of the feedback and identified strategies. While valuable information was collected from these five participants, with rich history and advocacy suggestions, those limitations must be kept in mind when extending recommendations to other institutions.

Implications

Several findings within the study may be useful to institutions that may be facing the decline or removal of PAI requirements or programs. When looking at all of the factors, as indicated during the interviews, the key is ensuring quality of instruction. To accomplish this, many of the successful institutions implemented the following strategies:

Variety of Courses: Whether an institution had PAI as a requirement of all undergraduates, or as a very popular elective for the general education core, one characteristic was found of all – variety of courses. When looking at catalog requirements, survey feedback, and interview discussions, it was obvious that institutions realized the need to meet student interests by providing several course options, and being flexible with the offerings as those interests change. In addition, some institutions that required PAI for graduation had also built variety within the requirement. To accomplish this, at least one course or credit was required for all students, while the remaining credits could be satisfied by other elective options. This provided students a standard of

education and ensured topics were covered that influenced lifestyle behavior, while providing student ways to apply these techniques through activity courses that met their interests.

Faculty Assignment: Across the spectrum of institutions that currently have PAI as a requirement, all utilized a mixture of approaches to providing instruction. The reason for assigning instruction to full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, part-time staff, or graduate assistants, varied depending on the size of the institution, structure of the requirement, and budgetary constraints. Institutions that required PAI for graduation, most often used full-time faculty and adjunct faculty for instruction, while those who only listed as an elective, primarily utilized adjunct-faculty, part-time staff, and/or graduate assistants.

One common characteristic, regardless of the situation, was that the institutions that currently offer PAI whether as a requirement or elective, have consistent leadership, management, and oversight of the instruction. The strategy to provide oversight varied across institutions, but it always involved a full-time faculty or staff member to manage course scheduling, instructor assignment, and evaluation of classes. In most cases, this person held a position as a lecturer, not a tenure-track faculty member. The key for faculty assignment is to ensure that the faculty and/or staff that are slated to teach are reliable, consistent, and are experienced and credentialed to provide the instruction required for and desired by students.

Academic Rigor and Assessment: Quality is often difficult to measure in an academic setting since many variables can contribute with instruction. However, when exploring the data and conversations in this study, measuring quality for PAI courses

came from implementation of standardized learning outcomes, end of course student evaluations, and enrollment trends. For three institutions that require PAI, standardized learning outcomes were implemented in courses within the PAI offerings. To achieve this goal, two of the three institutions required these outcomes to be completed prior to completing the activity electives. One institution embedded the outcomes within the one required competency-based course to ensure that all students were exposed to proper lifestyle well-being content, and upon completion were then given the elective options for activity-based courses. In comparison, the other institution used online modules that could be completed while the students were completing the required activity courses. Upon completing these modules, a certificate was provided to the students and the Director of PAI.

Addressing quality from multiple aspects is critical for the field of PAI in higher education. Doing so may alleviate any stress being placed on departments to advocate for the addition or retention of the requirement for undergraduate students. A need to investigate the current trend in all states and at all levels of higher education, is imperative. Once that information is compiled, a stronger advocacy plan can be developed that will include many more strategies that have been successfully utilized.

CHAPTER II

DISSEMINATION

One of the primary aims of this study was to distribute the findings so that others in the field of kinesiology could adopt strategies successfully implemented by others. Through conversations with peers in both states (NC and VA) during the last seven years, many faculty indicated that a potential change could occur to the PAI requirement at their institution, or that one had already occurred. It seemed that many were unsure as to how to successfully advocate for their courses or programs and needed assistance and guidance. From the findings of this study, based upon the strategies and characteristics of programs that have successfully retained the requirement, four recommendations are proposed. These recommendations are compiled in a report to be delivered to the 54 institutions that were involved in this study. These recommendations are for any administrators and/or faculty members at institutions that are currently offering, or considering offering PAI courses for undergraduate students.

Report and Recommendations

PAI courses have been a staple at colleges and universities since the turn of the 20th century, and continue to be in the 21st century. However, since the 1990s, PAI courses have been removed from undergraduate requirements or as offerings all together more frequently. Yet, in the midst of this change, several institutions continue to maintain their requirements and PAI offerings to undergraduates, providing quality instruction to

students and contributions to academic culture. During the summer and fall of 2018, information was collected and analyzed from institutions in North Carolina and Virginia to determine the current trends for PAI requirements, and identify strategies that have been implemented by institutions successfully maintaining these courses and requirements. Based upon these findings, characteristics, strategies, and suggestions have been compiled into four recommendations.

Recommendation 1: Offer a Variety of Courses (Capitalize on culture and resources)

Institutions that require PAI for undergraduates in both the states of NC and VA, have one glaring common characteristic- offering a variety of courses as a part of the requirement. To ensure that a variety of courses are offered, many institutions built multiple credits into the requirement. Of the 31 institutions in the study that require PAI for undergraduates, a variety of credit hours existed from one (minimum) to four (maximum) credits. In looking more closely, two credits (39%) were the most common offering, with four (6%) being the least.

These institutions provided multiple options to satisfy the credit requirements to meet institutional and departmental goals, and to build or retain enrollment. Using a variety of course options for students implements a strategy for meeting continual and evolving health and fitness needs of students. By keeping options available, students are exposed to health and fitness content needed to build knowledge, but also have an opportunity to explore and apply the knowledge in activity courses fitting their interests.

To provide basic health and fitness knowledge, several institutions implemented a required course along with the options. For example, seven of the 31 institutions require one course of all students, but also allow additional options for elective activity courses to satisfy the total credit requirement. This strategy was implemented to ensure that standardized content was provided across the board to all students, while also providing options that give all students a choice to pick from. This strategy allows assurance of academic quality while keeping the courses relevant with the changing interests and needs of students.

To determine what to offer, each institution had a different strategy or justification. Many institutions based course offerings on enrollment trends, which were used as direct measures of student interest. Another recommendation is to capitalize on college and regional resources to offer classes. For example, many institutions in the study were located in close proximity to outdoor regional opportunities such as rivers, mountains, and beaches leading institutions to offer hiking, kayaking, and even surfing. Often the physical and campus resources dictate what opportunities students are interested in, and institutions should offer courses that align with these resources.

No matter what courses or the variety that are offered, institutions must constantly evaluate and review these offerings to ensure viability. The courses must be reviewed to ensure that proper instruction is being offered, and student interests are being met. For example, several institutions indicated that over the last five years an increased interest has occurred for low-impact courses such as yoga and mindful-wellness meditation. This realization came from semester and annual reviews of enrollment and offerings, leading

to an increased number of sections of yoga being offered. This was a direct change from the courses being heavily athletics-focused. Had the institutions not been monitoring the situation and making annual adjustments, the students' activity needs and interests would not have been met.

Recommendation 2: Standardized Learning Outcomes

Many of the administrators stated having common student learning outcomes and a process for data collection was essential to measuring the success of the courses, and for advocacy. At least three institutions that participated in the interviews that retained the requirement, used standardized learning outcomes in required courses or modules. Rationale given for this strategy was because faculty had decided upon specific learning outcomes necessary to meet goals of the department and instruction. This could only be done by through the offering of one, required PAI course to all undergraduate students. Additional student learning outcomes were then embedded in the activity courses, but were differentiated depending upon the type and nature of the course.

Not only does use of consistent student learning outcomes provide a way to measure the learning and academic rigor of each course, it also builds a case for advocacy. Without student learning outcomes embedded in each course and analyzing data, advocacy becomes increasingly difficult. Using an example from one institution in the study who currently has the PAI courses "under the microscope" stated that not having these outcomes is an issue for advocating for retaining the courses or justifying them as a requirement. Having an academic component to all courses is key.

In comparison, another institution that currently requires PAI for all undergraduates, recently went through advocacy to retain it. During a general education core revision in 2012, the PAI courses came under scrutiny, which led to the department revising how the courses were delivered. One key component from the revision, was the addition of standardized student learning outcomes that covered health and wellness content. Instead of adding courses and credits, the faculty developed an online module certification course that students registered for and completed while enrolled in their activity electives. The strategy worked, through demonstrating how the courses are both academically relevant and rigorous, and aligned with institutional and college missions.

Any institution that has PAI either as an elective or requirement must ensure that academic rigor is present in all courses offered. Evaluation of PAI requirements at institutions is an increasing trend. From information shared in the survey, of the 31 participating institutions, four (13%) anticipate changes to the current PAI requirement. One of those four institutions currently requires PAI for all undergraduates and will be assessing and revising the General Education Core requirements in the next two years. The department chair stated that it is “expected the current PAI requirement will be explored during this core revision, and may be altered or removed all together.” As this trend continues in the field, it is imperative to have data readily available, especially to ensure students experience high quality of instruction, faculty can measure the effectiveness of teaching and learning, and build a case for advocacy should the need arise.

Recommendation 3: Consistent Faculty Assignment

Instructor assignment for PAI was a common theme that surfaced during the surveys and interviews. According to data collected in the surveys, for the institutions that required PAI, 75% used primarily full-time and adjunct faculty. In comparison, three institutions (10%) used only adjuncts and 2 (6%) only used graduate assistants. Why would institutions use full-time and adjunct faculty more often than others, especially when requiring PAI?

From the institutions that participated in the study, 10 out of 31 (32%) indicated during the last five years a change in teaching assignment had occurred. From this group, two indicated they initiated a change to full-time faculty with the goal of improving quality of the instruction. This theme also appeared within the interviews as many of the institutions who had successfully retained the requirement had strategic and sound reasons for changing the teaching assignments. For example, two of the institutions that participated in the interviews indicated a change from instruction being provided by athletic coaches. Upon review, many of the coaches were not qualified from credentialing or experience, and their duties in athletics distracted from giving full attention to students.

Not only were experience and credentialing reasons for assignment of full-time and adjunct faculty, but also consistency and availability. Two institutions indicated a preference for full-time and adjunct faculty instead of graduate assistants because they were “more reliable.” One such administrator stated that using graduate assistants becomes problematic. As soon as you train one, they leave. In addition, having full-time

faculty allows for quality of instruction and provides opportunities to retain the courses being taught, instead of being forced to offer courses based on the available instructors expertise.

Having an adequate number of full-time faculty in a discipline is essential to the quality of instruction at any institution. According to the accrediting agency for all institutions in North Carolina and Virginia, this is not only a recommendation but a requirement. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges, directly states in the newly published accrediting standards in 2017 that “the institution employs an adequate number of full-time faculty members to support the mission and goals of the institution,” and the number should be “sufficient to ensure curriculum quality” (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges, 2018). Therefore, it is recommended that institutions provide quality of instruction by using primarily full-time and adjunct faculty.

Recommendation 4: Constant Evaluation and Advocacy

All administrators, no matter what they had encountered at their institution practiced and preached a constant advocacy mindset. One such administrator stated that even though no known changes or questions were coming to the current PAI requirement, the department would always be prepared. Preparing for the unknown is always best because of the constant changing in higher education curriculum. Because of this, data collection is imperative.

Having data ready from enrollment, course objectives, and budgets are key to showing the value, both educationally and financially, to faculty and administrators.

From feedback that department chairs shared, they were well aware of the audience they needed to target in advocacy efforts, which was often faculty within the internal curriculum council and in their own departments and colleges, as well as academic administration.

For faculty, having the student learning outcomes available to show how the courses were academically rigorous, and aligned with undergraduate core and institution missions and goals was key. This information not only benefited the internal department by measuring quality, but could be used during curriculum council meetings where PAI courses may come into question. For institutions that did not have these data, it was concerning as they knew it would be needed, and had not yet developed a policy or procedures to collect it.

Student learning outcomes and student end of semester evaluations can also be useful when advocating to administration. Often Deans and Department Chairs need this data to measure the quality of instruction and make determinations on course offerings. However, for faculty that participated in this study, having enrollment and financial information was more vital when advocating to administration. For one such institution that has the requirement intact and recently advocated to retain it, monitoring enrollment numbers and net revenue was a standard practice each semester. The Coordinator stated that this information was very beneficial to the program as it influenced course offerings and the need for particular faculty (full-time vs. adjunct) but was more useful when advocating for more faculty to the Department Chair and Dean. In addition, the same

coordinator mentioned that having enrollment data shows that the courses are viable, and that students are very interested in the program.

None seemed to be “comfortable” with where their program was but knew that an advocacy mindset was key to continuing success and maintaining the requirement and courses. Therefore, it is recommended that PAI programs implement regular data collecting, tracking, and analysis that includes course and section enrollments, student learning outcome evaluations, end-of-semester student evaluations of instruction, and financial data. Having this information not only will provide opportunities to improve instruction but be prepared for advocacy.

Quality is key for any academic program or course and implementing strategies to build and monitor instruction is essential. For any institution that offers PAI courses each of the following is recommended to build quality:

- Provide a variety of courses
- Develop standardized learning outcomes
- Implement consistent faculty assignment of instruction
- Develop a constant evaluation and advocacy mindset

CHAPTER III

ACTION PLAN

It is crucial that those who are experiencing a reduction of PAI requirements, or who are anticipating them, have information and strategies to address it at their institutions. Based on the dissertation findings, a report has been created that focuses on promoting and maintaining PAI requirements by showcasing the strategies of universities that were successfully able to retain the requirement. Because many faculty from four-year institutions attend regional and national conferences, the findings and recommendations will be made available to organizations that hold such events. Proposals for presentations will be submitted to entities such as the Society of Health and Physical Educators, the National Association for Kinesiology in Higher Education, and the American College of Sports Medicine. Faculty and administrators from across the nation and globe attend these conferences to grow professionally, connect with other colleagues, and learn best practices and strategies to improve their own instruction and the programs and courses at their respective institutions. Providing quality information in the form of success strategies to retain and advocate for PAI at institutions would be a valuable contribution to the organizations and profession.

Findings will be presented at a poster session at the SHAPE American national conference in April of 2019. Highlighted within the poster will be statistics from the breakdown of categories of schools who currently have a requirement within each state,

the type of courses offered within the requirement, types of teaching assignments, and various statements of quality for programs. A synopsis of the trends from coding will also be highlighted and shared. For example, because quality of instruction, standardized course objectives, and providing students choice were all categories that regularly appeared during the interviews. Sample quotes from the interviews will be included in the poster session as talking points.

Connections between the findings and quality PAI will also be highlighted in the poster to provide suggested advocacy recommendations. For example, from the report, four recommendations were crafted based upon the findings in the study. Each of the recommendations will be listed with sample data, and related explanations on the poster. This is an important first step for dissemination as it will provide a preview for professionals in the field of Physical Education. This first step will provide a preview for professionals in the field and allow me to collect feedback on what information was valuable to professionals.

Beyond presenting and sharing the poster at the SHAPE America conference, the report and findings will be shared with another association with a more targeted audience of faculty and administrators who can directly use the information to cause a change in their institutions. The National Association of Kinesiology in Higher Education (NAKHE) is an entity that was created to “foster leadership in kinesiology administration and policy related to teaching, scholarship, and service in higher education” (National Association for Kinesiology in Higher Education Mission). This organization is comprised of kinesiology faculty and administration in higher education, unlike SHAPE

America which is for professionals in all levels of Physical Education. NAKHE and its membership of those in kinesiology in higher education can influence policy and decisions at the local, state, and national level. During the national conference, presentations and sessions are often held that focus on policy development, sharing of best practices, curriculum development, and student success for kinesiology in higher education. The structure and membership create a valuable opportunity to distribute this information.

Two dissemination strategies will be implemented in NAKHE. First, a presentation proposal will be submitted for the 2020 national conference. The presentation will focus on delivering information from the study directly related to advocacy, specifically the findings and recommendations for implementation of successful programs. Making these recommendations directly to members of NAKHE may promote analysis of current requirement, and program structure for PAI at the member institutions. Also, a panel discussion will be suggested to NAKHE to discuss the issues surrounding PAI at institutions. The panel would be comprised of administrators and faculty that have experienced challenges, are anticipating challenges and changes to curriculum, and ones that have been successful at implementation and maintenance of their course and requirements.

Topics and questions developed from the study can be used to create a focused and targeted discussion that will allow the panel to interact with those in the audience. This avenue will foster sharing of information to provide assistance and strategies to those who need it most. Based upon these steps, faculty and administrators can then

implement suggested changes at their institutions to enhance PAI as well as prepare for advocacy for any potential future targeting of PAI.

During the study, an administrator shared that a positive college culture of wellness had been cultivated from a collaborative partnership between different campus departments. This institution had carried forward an initiative focused on the American College of Sports Medicine program Exercise is Medicine in partnership with the Department of Exercise Science and the Outdoor Recreation department. Based on this strategy, the information from this study should also be shared with professionals within the Exercise is Medicine program. This can be accomplished by presenting at the annual American College of Sports Medicine meeting where the World Congress on Exercise is Medicine convenes.

Members from various sub-groups within the field of kinesiology attend the World Congress such as professors, exercise physiologists, K-12 teachers, and fitness professionals from across the world. Having access to this plethora of professionals will provide a door to share recommendations and ignite ideas on developing collaborative partnerships to improve physical activity. At this presentation, best practices and recommendations from the report will be shared, specifically focused recommendations for strategy implementation in conjunction with Exercise is Medicine initiatives at colleges and universities across the country.

To also develop a collaborative focus for implementation of these recommendations, presentation at the Association of Outdoor Recreation and Education (AORE) will be beneficial. During two of the conversations with administrators, each

shared that a strong partnership existed with the on campus Outdoor Recreation department. As a part of this relationship, courses were offered concurrently and equipment and other resources were shared. The mission of AORE focuses on “providing opportunities for professionals and students in the field of outdoor recreation and education and address issues common to college, university, community, military, and other not-for-profit outdoor recreation and education programs.” Faculty, staff, and professionals focused in outdoor recreation and education from across the country will be present at the annual meeting and conference, which will provide a valuable opportunity to share these recommendations. The presentation will be founded on working tougher on college and university campuses to improve physical activity and health of students through sharing resources to improve the quality of PAI courses.

REFERENCES

- Adams, T., & Brynteson, P. (1995). The effects of two types of required Physical Education programs on attitudes and exercise habits of college alumni. *The Physical Educator*, 52(4), 203-208.
- American College Health Association. (2010). American College Health Association: National college health assessment spring 2008 reference group data report. *Journal of American College Health*, 57(5), 477-488.
- American College Health Association. (2015) National College Health Assessment II: Undergraduate Student Reference Group Executive Summary Spring 2015; ACHA: Hanover, MD, USA.
- Armstrong, S.H., Henderson, D.R., Williams, B.M. and Burcin, M.M. (2014). An evaluation of a college exercise leader program: Using Exercise Science students as advocates for behavior modification. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 11, 1635-1639.
- Cardinal, B. J., Sorensen, S. D., & Cardinal, M. K. (2012). Historical Perspective and Current Status of the Physical Education Graduation Requirement at American 4-Year Colleges and Universities. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 83(4), 503-512.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2014). Facts about physical activity: Some Americans are getting enough, but too many are not. Retrieved November 2017. <https://www.cdc.gov/physicalactivity/data/facts.htm>
- Coe, D., Pivarnik, J., Womack, C., Reeves, M., & Malina, R. (2006). Effect of physical education and activity levels on academic achievement in children. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 38, 1515-1519.
- Eisenberg, D., Goldrick-Rab, S., Lipson, S. K., & Broton, K. (2016). Too distressed to learn? Mental health among community college students. Madison, WI: Wisconsin HOPE Lab. Retrieved from http://www.wihopelab.com/publications/Wisconsin_HOPE_Lab-Too_Distressed_To_Learn.pdf
- Hardin, R., Andrew, D. P. S., Koo, G.-Y., & Bemiller, J. (2009). Motivational factors for participating in Basic Instruction Programs. *Physical Educator*, 66(2), 71-84.

- Henry, F.M. (1978). The academic discipline of Physical Education. *Quest*, 29(1), 13-29.
- Hensley, L. D. (2000). Current status of Basic Instruction Programs in Physical Education at American colleges and universities. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 71(9), 30-36.
- Leenders, N. Y. J. M., Sherman, W. M., & Ward, P. (2003). College Physical Activity Courses: Why do students enroll, and what are their health behaviors? *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport*, 74(3).
- Lumpkin, A., & Jenkins, J. (1993). Basic Instruction Programs: A brief history. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 64(6), 33-36.
- Massengale, J. D., & Swanson, R. A. (1997). The history of exercise and sport science. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- McArthur, L., & Raedeke, T. (2009). Race and sex difference in college student physical activity correlates. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 33(1), 80–90.
- McCristal, K. J., & Miller, E. A. (1939). A brief survey of the present status of the health and physical education requirement for men students in colleges and universities. *Research Quarterly*, 10(4), 70–80.
- National Association for Kinesiology in Higher Education Mission (n.d.) Retrieved February 8, 2019, from <https://www.nakhe.org/mission.html/>
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. (2018). *Resource Manual for the Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement* (Third Edition 2018). Atlanta, GA.
- Strand, B., Egeberg, J., & Mozumdar, A. (January 01, 2010). Health-Related Fitness and Physical Activity courses in U.S. Colleges and Universities. *Journal of Research*, 5(2), 17-20.
- Stellefson, M., Alber, J. M., Wang, M. Q., Eddy, J. M., Chaney, B. H., & Chaney, J. D. (2015). Use of Health Information and Communication Technologies to Promote Health and Manage Behavioral Risk Factors Associated With Chronic Disease: Applications in the Field of Health Education. *American Journal of Health Education*; Reston, 46(4), 185–191.

Williams, S. E., Greene, L., Satinsky, S., & Neuberger, J. (2016). Content analysis of Conceptually Based Physical Education in Southeastern United States Universities and Colleges. *Physical Educator*, 73(4), 671-688.

APPENDIX A
RECRUITMENT E-MAIL

Dear Dr. ,

My name is Jacob Surratt and I am the Dean of Transfer, Business, and Social Science at Wytheville Community College. I am also a Doctoral student in the Kinesiology Department at the University of North Carolina Greensboro.

I am writing to invite you to participate in a research study to investigate Physical Activity Instruction Requirements in Higher Education. This study will involve reviewing catalog information from four year institutions in North Carolina and Virginia. Gathering information from participants will help develop a clearer picture of the current status and changes in physical activity requirements. I am inviting you to participate in the study because of your physical activity leadership position at your institution. If there is someone else who would be in a better position to provide information about the physical activity requirement, I would appreciate it if you would let me know the contact information for that person.

If you decide to participate in this study, please provide information in the following survey regarding the Physical Activity Instruction requirements at your institution. The survey does not ask for any confidential information and will take only about 10 minutes of your time. More specifically, the survey asks about your current physical activity requirement, in addition to changes to the requirement (the catalog description is printed below). After completion of the survey, you may also be invited to participate in a follow-up interview.

Your participation is completely voluntary, and you can choose to be in the study or not. If you would like to participate in the survey, please click on the link below, which will take you to a consent form and the survey.

Physical Activity Instruction Requirements Survey Link

If you have any questions about the study, please email or contact me at jwsurrat@uncg.edu or (336)710-6135.

Thank you for your assistance in this research.

Sincerely,

Jacob W. Surratt

APPENDIX B
CATALOG CODING RUBRIC

Institution	Name
Carnegie Classification	Doctoral Universities: Highest Research Activity Doctoral Universities: Higher Research Activity Doctoral Universities: Moderate Research Activity Master's Colleges & Universities: Larger Programs Master's Colleges & Universities: Medium Programs Master's Colleges & Universities: Small Programs Baccalaureate Colleges: Arts & Sciences Focus Baccalaureate Colleges: Diverse Fields Baccalaureate/Associate's Colleges: Mixed Baccalaureate/Associate's Baccalaureate/Associate's Colleges: Associate's Dominant
Other Classification	Public Private, not for profit
State	NC VA
Average Undergraduate Enrollment	Number of enrollment
Total Enrollment	Number of enrollment
Department	Name of Department PAI courses are housed
Physical Activity Requirement for Kinesiology programs	Yes No
Course/Credit Requirement for KIN programs	List number of credits required
Physical Activity Requirement for all Undergraduates	Yes No
Credits for Requirement	List number of credits required
Courses that satisfy requirement	List courses from catalog

APPENDIX C

ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY

The purpose of this survey is to confirm the current physical activity instruction requirements for undergraduates at your college or university. In addition, questions ask about the historical changes to the requirement, and the instructors for the courses.

Thank you for taking time to answer the short seven question survey which should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

1. Please select YES below to provide informed consent and access the survey
2. Is the published physical activity instruction requirement for all undergraduate student accurate?
 - a. If you answered NO to question 2, what is the current requirement, and course options to satisfy it?
3. Is the published physical activity instruction requirement for kinesiology program majors accurate?
 - a. If you answered NO to question 3, what is the current requirement for kinesiology majors?
4. Who currently teaches the physical activity instruction courses? Please select all that apply.
5. Has there been a change in who teaches the physical activity courses within the last three to five years?
 - a. If you answered YES to question 5, what was the change the reason for the change?
 - b. Who taught physical activity courses in the past (select all that apply)?
6. Has the current requirement for physical activity instruction changed within the last three to five years?
 - a. If you answered YES to question 6, what was the change, and what was the reason for the change?
 - b. If you answered NO to question 6, were changes considered but not made? If so why?
7. Are there anticipated changes to the current physical activity instruction requirement?
 - a. If you answered YES to question 7, what are the anticipated changes?

APPENDIX D

ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Thank you for agreeing to participate in an interview for this research study to investigate physical activity requirements in higher education. Your participation is completely voluntary and can stop at any time during the interview.

1. How is the requirement for undergraduates and kinesiology programs implemented?
2. What is the administrative structure?
3. How are activity courses evaluated?
4. How has the Physical activity course requirement been changed or maintained?
5. Are there planned changes for the future?
6. Have changes been considered but were not made?
7. What were the strategies implemented to maintain the current requirement?
8. Has the requirement been challenged?
9. How would you argue for expanding or dropping the requirement?
10. How is physical activity viewed at the college/university?
11. What is an ideal physical activity instruction program?

APPENDIX E

ADDED RESULTS TABLES

Supplementary Table 1. PAI for Undergraduates: Carnegie Classification

	PAI requirement for Undergraduates		Participating Universities/Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	34	62.9%	54	100%
Baccalaureate Colleges: Arts & Sciences	6	75%	8	15%
Baccalaureate Colleges: Diverse Fields	8	80%	10	19%
Master's Small Programs	3	75%	4	7%
Master's Medium Programs	5	63%	8	15%
Master's Larger Programs	8	89%	9	17%
Doctoral: Moderate Research Activity	1	50%	2	3%
Doctoral: High Research Activity	4	31%	13	24%

Supplementary Table 2. PAI for Undergraduates: Size of Institution

	PAI requirement for Undergraduates		Participating Universities/Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0-5,000	19	73%	26	48.1%
5,000-10,000	9	69%	13	24.2%
10,000-15,000	1	50%	2	3.7%
15,000-20,000	1	50%	2	3.7%
20,000-25,000	1	33%	3	5.5%
25,000+	3	38%	8	14.8%

Supplementary Table 3. Number of Credits for Requirements

Number of Credits Required of 31 Institutions		
	Number	Percent
1 credit	7	23%
2 credits	12	39%
3 credits	5	16%
4 credits	2	6%
Range Offered	5	16%

Supplementary Table 4. Anticipated PAI Changes

	Number	Percent
Total Institutions	31	100%
Anticipate change to current PAI requirement	4	13%
Reason for anticipated changes:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently under a curriculum review and PAI may be removed from Gen Ed Core • Proposal to exempt varsity athletes from the requirement • Reduction in the number of required courses. 		

Supplementary Table 5. PAI Requirement and Instructor Assignment

	Full-time and Adjunct Mix	Adjunct Only	Graduate Assistants Only
Institutions with Requirement	15	3	2
20 of 34 institutions that require PAI participated in the survey.			

Supplementary Table 6. Instructor Assignment and Changes

Institution	Classification	Current Assignment	Changes	Previous Assignment
1	Private, non for profit	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct faculty	No	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct faculty
2	Private, non for profit	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct faculty	No	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct faculty,Part-time instructors,Adjunct instructors
3	Public	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct faculty	No	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct faculty
4	Private, non for profit	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct faculty	Yes	Part-time instructors,Adjunct instructors
5	Private, non for profit	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct faculty	No	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct faculty
6	Private, non for profit	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct faculty	No	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct faculty
7	Public	Adjunct faculty	Yes	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct faculty,Part-time instructors
8	Private, non for profit	Full-time/regular faculty,Part-time instructors	Yes	Full-time/regular faculty,Part-time instructors
9	Public	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct faculty	No	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct faculty,Part-time instructors
10	Public	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct faculty,Graduate Assistants	No	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct instructors
11	Private, non for profit	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct faculty	No	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct faculty

12	Public	Adjunct faculty, Graduate Assistants	Yes	
13	Public	Full-time/regular faculty, Adjunct faculty	No	Full-time/regular faculty, Adjunct faculty
14	Public	Adjunct faculty	No	Adjunct faculty
15	Private, non for profit	Full-time/regular faculty, Adjunct faculty	Yes	Full-time/regular faculty, Adjunct faculty, Adjunct instructors
16	Public	Full-time/regular faculty	No	Full-time/regular faculty
17	Private, non for profit	Full-time/regular faculty, Adjunct faculty	Yes	Full-time/regular faculty
18	Public			
19	Private, non for profit	Adjunct faculty, Part-time instructors, Graduate Assistants	Yes	Full-time/regular faculty, Adjunct faculty
20	Private, non for profit	Full-time/regular faculty, Adjunct faculty, Part-time instructors	Yes	Full-time/regular faculty, Part-time instructors
21	Public	Graduate Assistants	No	Full-time/regular faculty, Part-time instructors
22	Private, non for profit	Full-time/regular faculty, Graduate Assistants	No	Full-time/regular faculty
23	Private, non for profit	Full-time/regular faculty, Adjunct faculty	No	Full-time/regular faculty, Adjunct faculty, Part-time instructors, Adjunct instructors
24	Private, non for profit	Full-time/regular faculty, Adjunct faculty	No	Full-time/regular faculty, Adjunct instructors
25	Private, non for profit	Part-time instructors	Yes	Part-time instructors
26	Public	Full-time/regular faculty, Adjunct	No	Full-time/regular faculty, Adjunct

		faculty,Graduate Assistants		faculty,Adjunct instructors
27	Public	Full-time/regular faculty	No	Full-time/regular faculty
28	Public	Part-time instructors,Graduate Assistants	No	Full-time/regular faculty,Part-time instructors
29	Private, non for profit	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct faculty,Part-time instructors,Graduate Assistants	Yes	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct faculty,Part-time instructors,Adjunct instructors
30	Private, non for profit	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct faculty	No	Full-time/regular faculty,Adjunct instructors
31	Public	Full-time/regular faculty,Part-time instructors,Graduate Assistants	No	Full-time/regular faculty,Part-time instructors,Adjunct instructors

Supplementary Table 7. Anticipated Changes to Requirement

Institution	Classification	Change to Current Requirement?	Changes	Reason changes were considered ?
1	Private, non for profit	No		No
2	Private, non for profit	No		No related to PA requirements
3	Public	No		No changes were considered.
4	Private, non for profit	No		No
5	Private, non for profit	No		
6	Private, non for profit	No		No
7	Public	Yes	Physical activity classes were not required. In	

			most colleges students couldn't use the credits earned in Physical Activity classes as an elective to count toward graduation. In the last two years this was changed. Students are now allowed to take Physical Activity classes to count as elective credits. The number of credits a student can count depends on the colleges. For instance the College of Health and Human Services has no restrictions on how many Physical Activity classes can count as electives. The College of Science allows 2 credits.
8	Private, non for profit	Yes	Full-time dedicated staff now teach
9	Public	No	
10	Public	No	
11	Private, non for profit	No	
12	Public	No	
13	Public	No	
14	Public	No	
15	Private, non for profit	No	
16	Public	No	
17	Private, non for profit	Yes	It used to be that athletes received one semester hour of credit that counted as the activity component of our health and wellness requirement. Now they

			do not receive any academic credit for athletics but participation in athletics waives the one credit of physical activity requirement. We also have updated and changed our EXS courses that count towards the academic component of our health and wellness requirement.
18	Public		
19	Private, non for profit	No	
20	Private, non for profit	Yes	We revamped our Gen Ed curriculum. Now it no longer requires two phys ed. courses. Instead there is one 2 credit hour "wellness" requirement
21	Public	No	
22	Private, non for profit	No	
23	Private, non for profit	Yes	the requirement used to be for all undergraduates
24	Private, non for profit	No	
25	Private, non for profit	No	
26	Public	No	
27	Public	No	
28	Public	No	
29	Private, non for profit	No	
30	Private, non for profit	No	
31	Public	No	